

31  
40

**St. Thomas More College**  
**Phil 140 MO1**  
**Test #3**

34  
40

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Student Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**General Instructions:** This test has three parts. Do each question in each part, as instructed below. No aids permitted.

**Part I**

For each of the propositions below, indicate whether it is true or false, using where appropriate, the letter, "T" to indicate truth, and the letter, "F", to indicate falsehood. (2 marks for each question)

1. F An inductive argument is strong provided that it is not weak.
2. T The argument below is monotonic:  
The book-shelf has two shelves of books  
The first shelf has 5 books.  
The second shelf has 7 books.  
-----  
The book shelf has 12 books.
3. F In a civil suit, the plaintiff can't make the better case than the defendant and fail to meet the standard of proof.
4. F All valid arguments are uncontroversially valid in virtue of logical form alone.
5. T An inductive argument can be good and yet, unbeknownst to the arguer, have a false conclusion.
6. T If the prosecution in a criminal trial discharges his or her burden of proof, then the jury will find the accused guilty.
7. F The Gambler's Fallacy is a special case of hasty generalization..
8. T Every inductive argument, in the broad sense, is fallible
9. T An argument is non-ampliative only if the information content of the conclusion is contained in the information content of all the premisses taken together.
10. F An argument is non-monotonic if simply adding premisses might improve the logical quality of the consequence relation.

18  
20

Part II

For each of the inductive arguments below, if the argument is fallacious, identify which of the following types of fallacy it illustrates; otherwise, write "none". (2 marks for each question)

Fallacies

*The fallacy of insufficient statistics, the fallacy of biased statistics, the gambler's fallacy, post hoc fallacy*

a) I wouldn't trust the attendants at Boris' Garage. For I once had my car serviced there, and the attendant charged me 10 dollars more than he should have done.

2 Evaluation Insufficient statistics

b) Our team is bound to lose next Friday. Every Thursday they go out drinking, regardless of whether they play the next day. So they are never fully fit to play on Friday's.

0 Evaluation Post hoc fallacy

(We don't know for sure that the cause of losing is the drinking on Thursday.)

c) After placing a bet on each of 15 consecutive spins of the roulette wheel, Jones won 12 times. I think that if we bet with Jones we will start to win.

[None.]

0 Evaluation ~~Insufficient statistics: a sample of 15 on a random process that could happen a thousand times in one night is not statistically relevant.~~

d) Either I have little aptitude for logic or this text is badly written, so I won't take this course. For I tried reading a middle section one something called truth-functional propositional logic, but I couldn't understand a single sentence.

2 Evaluation Both biased & insufficient statistics

e) Lucy: Beethoven wasn't so great. Why do people think he was so great?

Schroeder: What do you mean Beethoven wasn't so great?

Lucy: Could Beethoven be so great, if some of his music is boring, which it is? For every time I tried to listen to some music by Beethoven, I got bored.

2 Evaluation Fallacy of biased statistics: each sample comes from the opinion of Lucy, who is ~~not~~ (necessarily) representative of the entire population, most of whom find Beethoven to be "great".

~~Insufficient statistics~~

I would think this was true but I don't know it.

### Part III

7  
10  
For each of the following analogical arguments, determine whether its consequence relation is weak, moderate, or strong. (2 marks each)

a) Artificial abortion, even during the first three weeks of pregnancy, ought not to be permitted in law. For given the known physiological similarities between the unborn and infants, the rule of precedents would require that we permit infanticide (i.e. the killing of infants), and infanticide is clearly a moral wrong that our laws ought to prohibit.

2 Weak: there are not enough relevant similarities between an embryo and an infant for this argument to stand alone.

b) Dogs have a right to be free from abuse, a right that ought to be respected in some branch of human law. For i) all human beings have this right, regardless of their actual intellectual capacity, and so primarily in virtue of being living things that are capable of suffering harms and enjoying goods and ii) dogs are also living beings capable of suffering harms and enjoying goods.

0 Weak: there are many relevant differences between dogs and humans, despite the fact that they both consume goods and are able to suffer harm.

c) Look. States are quite similar in several relevant respects to the citizens of a state: states, just as the individual citizens within a state, have interests, and in the pursuit of those interests may act justly or unjustly towards one another. So just as we have civil and criminal laws within a state to hold people to account when they pursue their interests or resolve their conflicts unjustly, we should also have at least some laws that may be applied to hold states to account when they resolve their conflicts or pursue their interests unjustly.

2 Moderate: Some relevant similarities between states & individuals are presented. There are still relevant differences. (ex: the actions of a state do not represent the intent of each individual in the state)

d) Taking opiates for medical reasons is permissible, since, in some cases, they are the only medications that will sufficiently ease the extreme pain of patients. But most opiates are much more addictive and hazardous than marijuana, and, in some cases, marijuana is the most effective pain reliever for people in extreme chronic pain. So taking marijuana for medical reasons should be permissible, also.

2 Strong: The relevant similarities are strong, and the relevant differences make the case even stronger (ex: addictive nature).

e) A dialectic is like a game of chess. In each, one must follow certain rules to accomplish some set characteristic end, and for each, one requires skill to perform well. Now, in chess, the ultimate aim of each player is to win - e.g. by check-mating one's opponent. So similarly, for dialectic, the ultimate goal of each participant is to win - e.g. by refuting one's opponent's position or by defending one's position against one's opponent's attempted refutations.

1 If we accept all the premisses, the analogy is strong and the similarities (as presented) are sufficient.

One could argue that the ultimate goal of dialectic is a consensus on the truth, not to "win".

↳ This point considerably weakens the argument. It is also one that is already in the text. It is no way in which dialectic is better than formal debate.